G. R. S. 59] GPB—15 (00- 20 12 1)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1901-02
(Miscellaneous)

File No. 79

Serial Nos. 1-22

Papers Filed.

Month June 1907

SUBJECT.

Passed orders in the matter of the alleged alienation of the Jodi Village of Kanle Vaderhalli, endowed to the Sri Prasanna Ranganadeswara Swamy of Kolala Village, Tumkur Taluk.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
	604-21

Mysore Government
General & Revenue Secretariat.

File No. (if any)

Directions.—

No., date and purport of receipts to be entered in red, and office note in black ink in order of dates.—To be written only on one side and inside the line of margin

Revised Office Note.

Branch

Revenue.

Subject.

Letter no. 413 dt the 10th February 1904 from the Dy Comr, Tumkur District regarding the transfer of patta of the Jodi Kanthevaderahalli village, Tumkur Taluk.

Note

The Dy Comr states that from the enquiry made by him, he is convinced that the jodi village originally granted in 1667 to Lakshmipathi Sastri rightly belongs to the temple of Prasanna Nanjundeswaraswami and that through fraud or otherwise, it was settled as personal inam in the name of Guruvamurthi Bhatta and Narayana Bhatta during the Mahr Settlement.

In May 1897, Krishnappa, a distant relative of Guruvamurthi Bhatta and Narayana Bhatta who died issueless, claimed the transfer of the village in his name Sub

Guruvamurthi Bhatta's sister's daughter claimed at the same time the transfer of the village in her name. In the meanwhile Krishnappa sold the village to Sithakal Venkata Krishnayya for Rs 450/-. One Ramasastri of Aruda represents that the village belongs to the temple and that Krishnappa had no right to sell it away. The goldsmith Venkata Krishnayya consents to make over the village to the temple 20 years hence and to pay in the meanwhile Rs 9 annually to the temple besides the godi due to Govt. The Dy Comr requests sanction to this arrangement and does not wish to go behind the inam settlement.

The Dy Comr apparently has arrived at an amicable settlement by which the sale made by Krishnappa would be recognised

If the village was by fraud settled as personal Inam, the question arises whether the settlement can be revised at this distance of time.

To show that his village was granted to his temple, the following documents are cited:—

1 The original Sanad granted by Sanjaraja Wodayer Bahadur to Lakshmipathi sastri Dj Salivahana Saka 1694 corresponding to the year 1773 A.D

× Slip A.

1. Order of Kilaka (1789-90) issued by the Amildar

⁂ Slip B.

1. Order of Pramadicha (1794-95)

Slip D.

1 Copy of Paravana of Plavanga Bhadrapada (1788-89)

o Slip E.

1. Order of Swabhanu ~~(illegible)~~ (1824-25) issued to Sithakal Sekdar.

⊗ Slip F.

The following documents show that the village was granted for personal benefit:.

1. The Sanad granted by Mr Purnayya to Ramasastri and Mallavadhani of 'Krodhana' (1805-6).

2 Slip G.

1. × Order of Krodhana (1805-6) issued to Ramasastri and Mallavadhani following the Sannad granted by Mr Purnayya

× slip A.

⊗ The copy of the grant-deed Register in the Kannada file shows that the village has been settled as personal Inam.

⊗ slip 2.

Submitted for orders.

DLN
13/5/04

The Upparus claimed have come through the Rev Commissioner Affair all, the amount ment proposed by the Govt appears the very reasonable under the circumstances may be regarded as the necessary expenditure all the parties concerned.

A draft proceeding the Govt's recommendation is put up herewith for orders

17/5/04

Submitted with draft
DLN
1 04

S

Please send the papers to the Rev Comr for favor of submission with his opinion — H 26/5/04

Submitted with draft.
H
27/5/04

To

Serial No 2

The Rev: Comr in Mysore.

Docket No R 3740 of The 31st May 1904.

Calls for his opinion.

Serial No 3

From the Rev. Comr in Mysore.

Letter No 7892 dated the 8th June 1904.

States that the course suggested by the Dy Comr seems to be one which the Muzrai Deptt may adopt and that it should be fixed by a document to be executed by the present holder in favour of the temple in appropriate terms.

As this subject concerns the Muzrai Deptt, may the file be forwarded unofficially to the Secretary in the Muzrai Deptt for opinion and regarding the order proposed to be issued, according to the accompanying draft. The question is altogether a Muzrai one. I think that it would be better to transfer it for disposal to the Muzrai Secretary. I accompanying the draft is returned herewith.

HH 6/7/04

Forwarded unofficially.

MYSORE GO
No 128
MUZRAI DEPT

Received
11/7/04

Secy. to Govt. in the Revenue
Dept- 817/1504

Offg Secy: Regd
D-Es,

U O 2 d 9-7-04

Under the peculiar circumstances of this case, where the original grant was for Devadaya purposes, but which was confirmed at the Inam Settlement as a personal inam, the compromise suggested by the Collector seems to be the best solution of the question.

A draft is put up.

A Ramakrishna Rao
31/8/04

Subd to the Diwan
through the 2d Secy

65
31-8-04

Secy

2/9
3

Read
21
3/9/04

3/9/04

1457
6 9-04

Note continued:—

The draft approved by Sri Krishnamurti, Sale Deed, was issued in Govt. Ro. No. 1074 6 by 19th April 1904.

Slip O

With reference to the above the Dy Commr., forwards the agreement* in the form adopted after consultation with the Govt. Advocate, executed by Goldsmith Venkatakrishnaiya*

(in his No 974 dt 15 5 06)

Slip Q

A draft is submitted approving the action taken.

Submitted.
21 1 [illegible] 15/5/06

Issue.
20/5/06

Muz. 8

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Note continued.

The draft approved was accordingly issued.

* no: 887/2817, dated 10th December 1906

Subbamma has memorialized H. H. The maharaja praying for a re-consideration of the Govt. order relating to the godi Kante Vaderahalli Village. She solicits that during her life time, she may be permitted to remain in possession of the said village; and that after her death, it may pass on, as ordered by Govt. to the Sri Prasanna Nanjundeswaraswamy temple. The memorial has been referred for disposal, to this office.

Submitted.

may the Dy Commissioner be requested to report on the points now raised in the petition.

22/12/06

GPB—3,000—22-6 06

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

Note continued:—

In reply to the enquiry ordered on page 7 of this note, the Dy comm.r of the Tumkur District submits a detailed report with his letter No 995 dy 18th June 1907. He gives a history of the case which has been already related in Govt. Pro: No 1074-6 dy 20th Sept. 1904 (printed copy of which is subd.) and states that no reconsideration of the orders already passed is called for.

May the memorialist be informed accordingly?

Submitted for orders.

Muz. 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Muzrai Secretary's Remarks.

After fully going into the circumstances of this case, Government Proceedings No. 1074-6, dated 20th September 1904 were issued under the orders of the late Dewan and the late 2nd Councillor. Upon the present petition for review addressed to His Highness the Maharaja the Deputy Commissioner of Tumkur (Mr. Dorasami Iyer) reports that there are no reasons for disturbing the arrangement made in the Government order of 1904 under which the right of the temple to the village was acknowledged and the present holder, a goldsmith, was allowed to keep possession of the lands for 20 years in consideration of his having purchased it for valuable consideration.

The Memorialist Subbamma objects that the Devadaya Inam land should not be in the possession of a non-brahmin. There is no rule to that effect and the present holder, a goldsmith, holds the village merely as a lessee under the temple. The argument

GPB—3,000—22-6 06

10

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

herefore does not appear to require an notice.

The petitioner may, it is submitted, be rejected.

Submitted to the
2nd Councillor.

Shamta Rao

28th June 1907.

may be rejected
By
29/6/07

Draft accepts
29/6/07

Dt 29/6/07

File no 1079-1903-04
S no 1.

R 2560/



Sl 1

From The Deputy Commissioner of Simla.

To The Secretary to the Govt of H.H. the Maharaja of Nepal, General & Revenue Department

Dated 10th

Despatched 25th February 1904

Received

General No. 413

No.

Enclosure No./ file & 1 enclosure

* sent separately

Ordered accordingly

Submitting for orders the remarks recorded regarding the transfer of Patta of the Hamlet Kanakatti Jeede village Ambur Taluk

Sub'd with Note

16/4/04

Deputy Commissioner's office,
Trunkur District,
Trunkur 10th February 1904.

From

M S Narayana Rao Esq,
Deputy Commissioner,
Trunkur District.

To

L. Anantasami Rao Esq, B.A,
Offg Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit herewith the vernacular records regarding the transfer of Patta of the Kantevaderahalli Jodi village, Kolala Sammath, Trunkur Taluk and to state as follows:-

From the marginally noted Sannads, &c, (enclosed in a tin case) it will be seen that this Jodi village was granted so long back as 1667 to one Lakshmipati Sastri by His Highness Kanjiraja Wodayer Bahadur.

The

1 Original Sannad granted by Kanjiraja Wodayer Bahadur to Lakshmipati Sastri
1 Translation of ditto
1 Original Sannad granted by Immadi Kempa Narasaraja Wodayer Bahadur to Ramanujadas Ramanujadas
1 Translation of ditto
1 Original Sannad granted by Immadi Kempa Narasaraja Wodayer Bahadur to Ramanujadas Ramanujadas
1 Translation of ditto
1 Original Sannad granted by Immadi Kempa Narasaraja Wodayer Bahadur to Lakshmipati Sastri

The object of the grant was apparently the maintenance of Prasanna Nanjundeswara Swami temple at Kolal. This is strengthened by the fact that the grantee made over the village to one Mallavadhani whom he appointed Dharmakarta of the temple with clear orders that the proceeds of the village should be devoted exclusively to the temple (vide copy of letter written by Mallavadhani to Lakshmipati Sastri). Mallavadhani having died without male issue his sister's sons Gurunmurthi Bhatta and Narasa Bhatta seem to have been appointed Dharmakartas of the temple and were looking after the management of the temple and the village. This state of affairs continued till the Inam settlement when a mistake seems to have arisen the Pattadar instead of being written in the name of the temple was somehow or other made in the name of the said Gurunmurthi Bhatta and Narasa Bhatta as personal Inam. These enjoyed the Kolal village and were also looking after the temple for their duties. They had no sons and therefore in obedience to

relative of theirs, viz, one Krishnappa son-
of Shambhatta claimed the transfer of the
Jodi village to his name in May 1849. At
the same time one Lakshamma of Doddballapur
came forward and represented that she
was Lyammanthi Bhatta's sister's daughter
and that Lyammanthi Bhatta at the time of
his death made over the village by a
will to her and that therefore the village
must be transferred to her name

In the meantime, the above said
Krishnappa seems to have sold away the
Jodi village to a goldsmith Venkatakrishna
for a Consideration of Rs 450.

When things stood thus one Rama-
sastri of Nandi represented that the Jodi
village originally belonged to the Prasanna
Venkatramana temple that it was entered
by mistake as personal Inam in the Quit
Rent Register, that a distant relative of
Lyammanthi Bhatta had no business
to sell away the village which was the
temple property and prayed that steps
might be taken to restore the village to the temple

With these facts before me I instituted a thorough enquiry into the matter and issued notices to all the persons to appear before me. From the statement made by them I am convinced that the Jodi village rightly belongs to the temple and that through fraud or otherwise the village was settled as a personal one. Goldsmith Venkatakrishnia deposed before me that he would willingly make over the village to the temple 20 years hence and that in the meantime he would pay as usual annually a sum of Rs 9/- for the temple and the Jodi amount as well to Government. This I consider is reasonable telling that it is now too late to go behind the Inam settlement and that he has purchased it for Rs 450. I request Government will be pleased to sanction this arrangement

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

B Bhima Rau
for Deputy Commissioner
of Trichinopoly District

72

Sl 2

File no 107 of 1903-04
Serial no 2.

(Secret)

R 2550

Sl 3

To

The Revenue
in Mysore.

No R 3744 Estate

Dy. 31/1/04

In forwarding herewith, in original with enclosure, for reference and obliging return, letter no: 4139 dated 10th February 1904 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, regarding the transfer of patta of the godi Kanthevadera-halli village in the Tumkur Taluk, has the honour to request that the ~~Dy Com~~ Revenue Commissioner will be so good as to favour Government with his opinion in the matter

"S. O"

Secy's order)

27/5/04
for Offg Secy

27/5/04

Compd 30/5

File no 1079/1903-04
Serial no 3

R 3987.

1904. SL4

From T. Ananda Row Esqr. B.A.
~~V. P. MADHAVA RAO, Esq., C.I.E.,~~
Revenue Commissioner
in Mysore.

To

The Secretary to Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
General & Revenue Departments.

Dated 8
Despatched 10 June 04.
Received
General No. 7892
No.

Enclosure No. one & Ver papers.

Submitting the Revenue Commissioner's opinion regarding the transfer of Patta of Jodi Kanthevaderhalli village in the Tumkur Taluk.

(3)

No. 7892

OFFICE OF THE REV COMR IN MYSORE
Bangalore, 8th June 1904

FROM T. Ananda Row Esq. B.A.
~~V P MADHAVA RAO, Esq. CIE,~~
Revenue Commissioner in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

SIR,

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your Docket No. R 3740 dated 31st May 1904 forwarding for my opinion letter No. 413 dated 10th February 1904 from the Deputy Commissioner Tumkur District, and its enclosures in original regarding the transfer of patta of Jodi Kanthevaderhalli village in the Tumkur Taluk and to state as follows.

2 The mistake now discovered seems to have originated with Purnaiya's Sannad. The course suggested by the Deputy Commissioner seems to be one which the Muzroi Department may adopt. It should be fixed by a document to be executed by the present holder Goldsmith Venkatakrishnayya in favor of the temple in appropriate terms. Probably a lease in terms which the ~~Legal~~ Government Advocate or other legal adviser approves of would be the correct thing.

3 The enclosures to your Docket under reply are returned as desired.

I have the honor to be,

Sir

Your most obedient servant,

T Ananda Rao

For Revenue Commissioner.

Typed- A.N.

MYSORE
738

No. 2.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Unofficial Memorandum.

The cases noted below was referred unofficially to the Secretary Inam Department, on the date specified.

Will the Secretary Inam Department kindly say when their return may be expected, or inform the General and Revenue Secretariat what action, it any, has been taken on them?

It is requested that the General and Revenue Secretariat may be favoured with a reply to this reminder not later than the 25th June

Dewan Bahadur Rao
For Secretary

Dated Bangalore
19th/20th August 1906.

C O No 2397-06 (File No 107 of 03-04 Land Revenue) Re Transfer of Patta of Jodi Kanthenaderhalli Village. Tumkur Taluk.

SL 6

666

To
The Government of His Highness
The Mahāraja of
Mysore.
&c.

The humble petition of
Ramasastry of Aruvalli
Dodda Ballapoor Taluq
most respectfully
Sheweth:—

This is a
Inoozroy matter.
& should therefore be presented
to the Inoozroy
Sarkar
17/8/15.

That the village of Kaudhay
Wodier Halley in the Taluq of Tumkur
was originally granted as Inam for
the upkeep of the temple of Prasanna
Narsimhaswara Swamy at Manné
Kolalla.

Submitted in Court
25/8/15

2. That the petitioners ancestor
Lakshmisathi Sastry built the said
temple and at his request the then
Government was pleased to grant
the said village as Inam for the
temple These facts are amply borne
out by the records in the Cutcherry.

3. That one Ramasastry was
appointed Dharmadhi Karil by the
said Lakshmisathi Sastry and
he and his descendants

be Dharmadi Karus and the last of these office holders Gurumoorthi Sastry has admitted these facts in his will which is also on record.

4. That in the later records and Samads of Devaraya Poorvi's time do not confer any personal rights on the holders of the office.

5. That one Arukkasalay Venkatakrishnaya puts himself forward as the vendee of the village from one Krishnasastri a Dayadi of Gurumoorthi Sastry but Venkatakrishnaya has paid no money for this purchase but has only executed a hypothecation deed in favour of Krishnasastry for the purchase money; and this arrangement is simply nominal and only meant to provoke litigation, and in the face of will of Gurumoorthi Sastry Krishnasastry cannot in any way acquire any rights over this village.

6. That the petitioner is given

to understand that the Deputy Commissioner of Tumkur has proposed to allow Anjanappa Venkatakrishnaiya to remain in possession for 20 years as a recompense for his money. But in the circumstances above mentioned Anjanappa Venkatakrishnaiya is entitled to no consideration and property meant for the upkeep of temple cannot fairly be left in the possession of a stranger and a usurper.

For these reasons the petitioner most respectfully prays that the Government will be graciously pleased to appoint the petitioner Dharmakarta of the said temple and restore to him possession of the property

[illegible]

16/8/54

MUZRAI

1904 — 1905 — Sl 7

FROM The Secretary to the Govt of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore, Muzr Deptt.

To The Secretary to the Govt of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore, Secl & Rev Deptts.

Dated Sept 4th

Despatched 6th ~~September~~ 1904

Received

General No 992-
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure —

His unofficial Memo No 2 dated 19th August 1904 requesting to be informed as to what action has been taken on the file re transfer of patta of Jodi Kanthirayanahalli village in Tumkur Taluk.

He, the Honble to state that the ~~has been finally disposed of~~ and submitted to the Diwan through the Secl Committee

in question
the file had been transferred to this Office for disposal and had the same has been

By order
6.9.1904
Secretary

2/9/04.

MGCPB—2,000—9 6 02

No. 1074-1

~~Mis. F 107-1903~~

By 19.9.04.

Mis F 79-1901

Read Sl 8

Letter no: 413 of the 10th ult

February 1904 from the

Dy Comr, Tumkur Dist,

regarding the transfer

of patta of the jodi

Kanthevaderahally

village in the Tumkur

Taluk -

Letter No 7892 of the 8th June 1904 from
the Hon Comr, C. on the subject

Order thereon

In 1667 Jodi Kan-
thevaderahally in the
Tumkur Taluk was
granted to Lakshma-
pathusastri by H H the
late Kanjaraya Wodayar
Bahadur, the object of the
grant having apparently
been the maintenance
of Prasanna Kanjinadeswa-
raswamy temple at
Kolala. During the
Inam Settlement, the
village was, perhaps
through mistake, settled

as personal Inam in the name of Gurumurthi Bhatta and Narayana Bhatta, who were then looking after the management of the temple and the village.

2. In May 1899, Krishnappa, a distant relative of Gurumurthi Bhatta and Narayana Bhatta both of whom died issueless, claimed the registry of the village in his name. Subbamma, Gurumurthi Bhatta's sister's daughter, claimed at the same time the transfer of the village in her name. In the meanwhile Krishnappa sold the village to a goldsmith by name Sithakal Venkata Krishnayya for Rs 450/-. In connection

with this sale, one
Ramasastri of Arndi
represents that the village
belongs to the temple
and that Krishnappa
had no right to sell it
away. The Dy Commr
who made a thorough
enquiry into the matter
states that he is convinced
that the village rightly
belongs to the temple
but that through fraud
or otherwise it was settled
as a personal Inam,
that it is too late now to
go behind the Inam
Settlement, that the
Goldsmith Venkara-
Krishnayya consents to
make over the village to
the temple 20 years hence
and to pays, in the mean-
while, Rs 9/- annually to
the temple besides the
Jodi due to Govt and that
the sanction of Govt may

be recorded to the arrangement come to, which is reasonable.

The Rev. Comr states that the course suggested by the Dy Comr seems to be one which the ellig rai Deptt may adopt & that it should be required by a document to be executed by the present holder, Goldsmith Venkatakrishnayya, in favour of the temple in appropriate terms.

3. The arrangement proposed is, under the circumstances, sanctioned. The Dy Comr is requested to take the necessary agreement from all the parties concerned, the form of the agreement being determined in consultation with the Govt Advocate in Mysore.

4. The communication should have come through the Rev. Comr.

11 10/9/04 Offg Secretary

9 IX.04

The Rev Comr in Mysore.

The Dy Comr, Tumkur

Dist, returning the enclosures.

Read 10-9-04

The Secretary to Govt in the Govt Religious Department.

Proceedings of the Government of H.H.the Maharaja of Mysore.

M U Z R A I.

Read:-

Letter No. 413 dated the 10th February 1904 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, regarding the transfer of Patel of the Jodi Kanteveerapura village in the Gubbi Taluk.

Letter No. 7892 dated the 6th June 1904 from the Commissioner on the subject

---

Order thereon No. 1074-6 Muzi:F.107-1903.
Dated Bangalore, 19 September 1904

In 1667 Jodi Kanteveerapura in the Tumkur Taluk was granted to Lakshmidhipathy by H.H.the late Maharaja Wodeyar Bahadur, the chief of the main lawful and right heir of the Pattadhara of Pagadamane in Hosangadi Temple the Inam Settlement, the village, originally the Jodi Settlement for service in the name of Gurumurthy Jodi Kanteveerapura, who were the Jodikas of the same village of the total land in the village.

2. In May 1902, Krishna, a distant relative of Gurumurthy Jodi Kanteveerapura, died on the 13th day of the month of the village. Subbamma, Gurumurthy's [illegible]

tranfer of the village in her name. In the meanwhile, Krishnappa sold the village to a goldsmith by name Sitharal Venkatakrishnaiya for Rs. 450/-. In connection with this sale, one Ramasastry of Arudi represents that the village belongs to the temple and that Krishnappa had no right to sell it away. The Deputy Commissioner who made a thorough enquiry into the matter states that he is convinced that the village rightly belongs to the temple but that through fraud or otherwise it was settled as a Personal Inam, that it is too late now to go behind the Inam Settlement, that the goldsmith Venkatakrishnaiya consents to make over the village to the temple 20 years' lease and to pay in the meanwhile, Rs 9-0-0 annually to the temple besides the Jodi due to Government and that the sanction of Government may be accorded to the arrangement come to, which is reasonable. The Revenue Commissioner states that the course suggested by the Deputy Commissioner seems to be one which the Inam Department may adopt and that it should be secured by a document to be executed by the present holder, Goldsmith Venkatakrishnaiya, in favor of the temple in appropriate terms.

3. The arrangement proposed is, under the circumstances, sanctioned. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to take the necessary steps to secure from all the parties concerned, the form of the agreement being determined in consultation with the Govt. Advocate in Mysore.

(Sd).T. Anant sa i Rao.

S e c r e t a r y

Kuzr. i De artment.

To.

The Rev nue Commissioner in Mysore.

" " Deputy Commissioner, Tirkur District, returning the encls

" " Secretary to Government in the G nl.& Rev. Departments.

Please send
final proof to
Murrai Department

By order
S. Balakanta
Rao

19/9/04.

1904-5

Government of His
Highness the Maharaja
of Mysore



788 Murrai

Proceedings

Dated 19th September 1904

No. 1074-6
Mur: F. 107-1903.

20/9/04

Passing orders in the
matter of the alleged
alienation of the Jodi
Village Kantevaderahalli, endowed to the Sri
Prasanna Nanjoondeswara
Swami temple at Kolala,
Tumkur Taluk.

Perused

20-9-04

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.
Muzrai, dated 19th September 1904.

READ—

Letter No. 413, dated the 10th February, 1904 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, regarding the transfer of patta of the Jodi Kantevaderahalli village in the Tumkur Taluk.

Letter No. 7892, dated the 8th June 1904, from the Revenue Commissioner on the subject.

No. 1074-6, DATED BANGALORE, 20TH SEPTEMBER 1904.

ORDER THEREON.—In 1667 Jodi Kantevaderahalli in the Tumkur Taluk was granted to Lakshmipathisastry by His Highness the late Nanjaraja Wodrear Bahadur, the object of the grant having apparently been the maintenance of Prasanna Nanjundeswaraswamy temple at Kolala. During the Inam Settlement, the village was, perhaps through mistake, settled as Personal Inam in the name of Gurumurtibhatta and Narayanabhatta, who were then looking after the management of the temple and the village.

2. In May 1899, Krishnappa, a distant relative of Gurumurtibhatta and of Narayanabhatta, both of whom died issueless, claimed the registry of the village in his name. Subbamma, Gurumurtibhatta's sister's daughter, claimed at the same time the transfer of the village in her name. In the meanwhile, Krishnappa sold the village to a goldsmith by name Sithakal Venkatakrishnaiya for Rs. 450. In connection with this sale, one Ramasastry of Arudi represents that the village belongs to the temple and that Krishnappa had no right to sell it away. The Deputy Commissioner who made a thorough enquiry into the matter states that he is convinced that the village rightly belongs to the temple but that through fraud or otherwise it was settled as a Personal Inam, that it is too late now to go behind the Inam Settlement, that the goldsmith Venkatakrishnaiya consents to make over the village to the temple 20 years hence and to pay in the meanwhile, Rs. 9-0-0 annually to the temple besides the jodi due to Government and that the sanction of Government may be accorded to the arrangement come to, which is reasonable. The Revenue Commissioner states that the course suggested by the Deputy Commissioner seems to be one which the Muzrai Department may adopt and that it should be secured by a document to be executed by the present holder, goldsmith Venkatakrishnaiya, in favor of the temple in appropriate terms.

3. The arrangement proposed is, under the circumstances, sanctioned. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to take the necessary agreement from all the parties concerned, the form of the agreement being determined in consultation with the Government Advocate in Mysore.

Drafted *Secy., Muzrai Dept.*

To—The Revenue Commissioner in Mysore.

The Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, returning the enclosures.

The Secretary to Government in the General and Revenue Departments.

1904-05

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 20th September 1904

No. 1074-6

Passing orders in the matter of the alleged alienation of the Jodi Village of Kantevaderahalli, endowed to the Sri Prasanna Nanjundeswara Swami temple at Kolala, Tumkur Taluk.

SBP—7-10-04—200

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.
Muzrai, dated 19th September 1904.

READ—

Letter No. 413, dated the 10th February, 1904 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, regarding the transfer of patta of the Jodi Kantevaderahalli village in the Tumkur Taluk.

Letter No. 7892, dated the 8th June 1904, from the Revenue Commissioner on the subject

---

No. 1074-6, DATED BANGALORE, 20TH SEPTEMBER 1904.

ORDER THEREON.—In 1667 Jodi Kantevaderahalli in the Tumkur Taluk was granted to Lakshmipathisastry by His Highness the late Nanjaraja Wodrear Bahadur, the object of the grant having apparently been the maintenance of Prasanna Nanjundeswaraswamy temple at Kolala. During the Inam Settlement, the village was, perhaps through mistake, settled as Personal Inam in the name of Gurumurtibhatta and Narayanabhatta, who were then looking after the management of the temple and the village.

2. In May 1899, Krishnappa, a distant relative of Gurumurtibhatta and of Narayanabhatta, both of whom died issueless, claimed the registry of the village in his name. Subbamma, Gurumurtibhatta's sister's daughter, claimed at the same time the transfer of the village in her name. In the meanwhile, Krishnappa sold the village to a goldsmith by name Sithakal Venkatakrishnaiya for Rs. 450. In connection with this sale, one Ramasastry of Arudi represents that the village belongs to the temple and that Krishnappa had no right to sell it away. The Deputy Commissioner who made a thorough enquiry into the matter states that he is convinced that the village rightly belongs to the temple but that through fraud or otherwise it was settled as a Personal Inam, that it is too late now to go behind the Inam Settlement, that the goldsmith Venkatakrishnaiya consents to make over the village to the temple 20 years hence and to pay in the meanwhile, Rs. 9-0-0 annually to the temple besides the jodi due to Government and that the sanction of Government may be accorded to the arrangement come to, which is reasonable. The Revenue Commissioner states that the course suggested by the Deputy Commissioner seems to be one which the Muzrai Department may adopt and that it should be secured by a document to be executed by the present holder, goldsmith Venkatakrishnaiya, in favor of the temple in appropriate terms.

3. The arrangement proposed is, under the circumstances, sanctioned. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to take the necessary agreement from all the parties concerned, the form of the agreement being determined in consultation with the Government Advocate in Mysore.

L. ANANTASAMI RAO,
Secy., Muzrai Dept.

To—The Revenue Commissioner in Mysore.
The Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, returning the enclosures.
The Secretary to Government in the General and Revenue Departments.

1904-05

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 20th September 1904

No. 1074-6

Passing orders in the matter of the alleged alienation of the Jodi Village of Kantevaderahalli, endowed to the Sri Prasanna Nanjundeswara Swami temple at Kolala, Tumkur Taluk.

SBP—7-10 04—200

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.
Muzrai, dated 19th September 1904.

READ—

Letter No. 413, dated the 10th February, 1904 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, regarding the transfer of patta of the Jodi Kantevaderahalli village in the Tumkur Taluk.

Letter No. 7892, dated the 8th June 1904, from the Revenue Commissioner on the subject.

No. 1074-6, DATED BANGALORE, 20TH SEPTEMBER 1904.

ORDER THEREON.—In 1667 Jodi Kantevaderahalli in the Tumkur Taluk was granted to Lakshmipathisastry by His Highness the late Nanjaraja Wodrear Bahadur, the object of the grant having apparently been the maintenance of Prasanna Nanjundeswaraswamy temple at Kolala. During the Inam Settlement, the village was, perhaps through mistake, settled as Personal Inam in the name of Gurumurtibhatta and Narayanabhatta, who were then looking after the management of the temple and the village.

2. In May 1899, Krishnappa, a distant relative of Gurumurtibhatta and of Narayanabhatta, both of whom died issueless, claimed the registry of the village in his name. Subbamma, Gurumurtibhatta's sister's daughter, claimed at the same time the transfer of the village in her name. In the meanwhile, Krishnappa sold the village to a goldsmith by name Sithakal Venkatakrishnaiya for Rs. 450. In connection with this sale, one Ramasastry of Arudi represents that the village belongs to the temple and that Krishnappa had no right to sell it away. The Deputy Commissioner who made a thorough enquiry into the matter states that he is convinced that the village rightly belongs to the temple but that through fraud or otherwise it was settled as a Personal Inam, that it is too late now to go behind the Inam Settlement, that the goldsmith Venkatakrishnaiya consents to make over the village to the temple 20 years hence and to pay in the meanwhile, Rs. 9-0-0 annually to the temple besides the jodi due to Government and that the sanction of Government may be accorded to the arrangement come to, which is reasonable. The Revenue Commissioner states that the course suggested by the Deputy Commissioner seems to be one which the Muzrai Department may adopt and that it should be secured by a document to be executed by the present holder, goldsmith Venkatakrishnaiya, in favor of the temple in appropriate terms.

3. The arrangement proposed is, under the circumstances, sanctioned. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to take the necessary agreement from all the parties concerned, the form of the agreement being determined in consultation with the Government Advocate in Mysore.

L. ANANTASAMI RAO,
Secy., Muzrai Dept.

To—The Revenue Commissioner in Mysore.
The Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, returning the enclosures.
The Secretary to Government in the General and Revenue Departments.

1904-05

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 20th September 1904

No. 1074 6

Passing orders in the matter of the alleged alienation of the Jodi Village of Kantevaderahalli, endowed to the Sri Prasanna Nanjundeswara Swami temple at Kolala, Tumkur Taluk.

SBP—7 10 04—200

1795

8/11/18

ಇಂದು ದಿನಾಂಕ ೧೫/೧೧/೧೯೫೬ ರಂದು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ೧೦ ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಸಭೆಯು ಸೇರಿತು.

ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳ ಹೆಸರುಗಳು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತಿವೆ.

೧ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು
೨ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು
೩ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೪ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೫ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೬ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೭ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೮ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೯ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೧೦ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು

ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸಭೆಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾಗಿ ಆಯ್ಕೆಯಾದರು. ಅವರು ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟರು.

ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿದ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತಿವೆ.

೧ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೨ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೩ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೪ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೫ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೬ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೭ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೮ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೯ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೧೦ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು

ಸಭೆಯು ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ೧೨ ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಮುಕ್ತಾಯವಾಯಿತು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ೧೫/೧೧/೧೯೫೬

Muz. 2.] MYSORE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT

ನಂ. 1778

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ~~ಹುಜೂರು ದಿವಾಣ ಕಚೇರಿ~~

ದಿ 22: 11: 04. ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದಾ.

ನೀವು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಜಾಹಿರ್ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾಹೆ 11 ನೇ

ಮಕ್ಕಂ 1795 ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಪರಾಂಬರಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.

MGCPB—500—31-8-01

2455

SLP

In the
High Court of Judicature at
Bombay

Writ Petition No. of 2004

Chembur

No: 2809
4-2-05,

~~1904 [illegible] 22 [illegible]~~

~~177 [illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]

B. C.

-1-05- Dfl-

4/2/05

Secy, Mun Dept

ks
3/2/05

No: 2810
4-2-05,

Copy to the D.C. Lumsden Dl- in Contn
of Govt- Pro no 1074-6 dated 19th
September 1904-

B

ks
3/2/05

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
3222
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

SL13

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.
Bangalore, 25th February 190 5

Rupees
Rs
27/2/05

No. 2065
1

Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore in the Muzroi Department, Bangalore, for disposal.

No. 1525 of 04-05.

By Order,

I. C. S.
Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore.

MUZRAI

19 —19 SR 14

FROM The Secretary,
Muz. Dept.
To The Dy. Commr.
Tumkur Dist.

Dated 15th
Despatched March 1905.
Received

General No. 3298 & 3299
Muzrai F. No. 79-1904
Enclosure 6.

In Contn of
Govt Ord. no. 1074-6, Dy
20th Septr 1904, passing
Orders in the matter of
the alleged alienation of
the godi Village of Kante
Vaderahalli, endowed to
the Sri Prasanna Ranjundes-
wara Swamy temple at
Kolala, Tumkur Taluk,
has the honor to forward
herewith, for disposal,
petn, reqd no. 3016, addressed

MGOPB—2,000—9-6-02

to The Dewan of Mysore,
by Subbamma of ~~Arasi~~
Arsedi in The Doddaballapur
Taluk, praying that, according
to The Will executed at
the time of The death of
Purrumoonty Bhatta, She
may be permitted to enjoy
the aforesaid ~~Jodi~~ Jodi village during
her life-time.

A memorial addressed
to H. H. The Maharaja by
Ramasastry, Jodidar of
Kantevadeerally is also forwarded
herewith, with its enclosures.

By order.

Draft

1/3/65
Secretary.

2/3/65

Sndt to The Cetn Sr.

1905/6

Sl/c.

From

K. Doraswami Iyer Esq.
Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District.

To

C. Ramachandra Rao Esq. B.A.
Secretary to the Govt: of H.H.
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Dated 14th
Despatched 15th } Mysore Sept.
Received May 1906

General No. 974
No.

Enclosure No. V.O. file

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
4873
16.5.06.
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

6/5/06

Copy sent with a draft

Para 2 of the Govt: Proc:
No: 1074-6 dated 20th
September, ordering
the alienation of the
Jodi Village of Kunte
Laderahalli, endowed
to the Sri Parvathamma
Swamy Devasthana
Temple at Nidala
Sirsukar Taluk.

I am in reference to the
above, the enclosure, I beg

Minutes.

Sl16

Read:--

Govt Pro. no. 974-6 dy the 29th April 1904 passing orders on the alienation of the Jodi Village of Kouthe-Vaderahalli, endowed to the Sri Prasanna Nanjundeswara swami Temple at Kolala in the Tumkur Taluk.

Docket no 974 dy 15th May 1906 from the Dy Commr. of the Tumkur Dt., submitting the agreement, in the form adopted after consultation with the Govt Advocate, executed by Soldasami the Ven Kattaki Swamiyar, the

absence of the Village

Order thereon :—

The agreement executed by the absentee and the tenant is appended. The document is required to have the signature of Sub Magistrate here.

20/5/06

Issue Notice

19/5/06

No. 5483 dt/23.5.06
Example

8217

2816 & 2817

No. 1506/25

2 Petitions as noted below addressed to H. H. the Maharaja are forwarded to Secretary to Govt Nuzvid Dept for disposal

No. 886 & 887

By Orders
Sd) T. Whitely
4-12-26
Private Secy to H. H. the Maharaja of Nuzvid

Aft. as per orders

Muz. 1 A]

190

From SR/8

To

The Dy Commr

Tumkur Distt.

Dated

Despatched 11. 1. 07

Received

General No. 2456

No.

Enclosure No. 2

In continuation of Govt Pro. no 5483 dated 23rd May 1906, has the honor to forward herewith memorial registered no. 887/2817 dated 10th December 1906, addressed to H. H. the Maharaja by Subbamma praying for a re-consideration of the Govt. Order relating to the godi

GPB—3,000—21-7-05

Kante Wadimhalli Village.

The Dy Commr is requested to enquire into the matter and submit a report on the points now raised in the petition

By order,

Dpt) 10/1/07

Secretary

ಕಂ ಕಾ ಇಲಾ ---

ಶ್ರೀ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಇವರು ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡಂತೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ —

7/1/07

రాకేశుని పంపించడ్డుడ్డ

యిలాగుండగా ఒక పట్టి గతి నుచ్చుడ్డ కోపంతో
తన తనకి మంత్రులతో ఆలోచనలు చేసి వారిని
తన్ని యిద్దరంతో దోవ పెట్టిన దళిత సభ్యుని తన్ని
నంతరము వాడిని పట్టుకొండు గ్రామ పన్నెండు
త్తా దోవర శోధన ఆదేశించుడ పట్టి వారిని
తర గ్రామ పన్నెండు పట్టి నంపి వేయుటలు
తన్ని సింహాసనము పట్టి ఆ ఆ యిలాగు
సుచ్చువల్ల నంబువర దినతిగా నందుకొన్ని
రదు గ్రామ పన్నెండు పట్టి నవరగ్గా దోవ
దనుతర మురువలాగ్ని భట్టను నత్తను.

యి నాంసేటి లోపంపలు కారులదల్లా దోవర జనిసరిగా
రిజిస్ట్రేషన్ తక్కువ్వు కలాంచేయుండ మురువలాగ్ని భ
ట్టను నారాయణ భట్టి యివరడిసరిగా నిజస్థగ్ లాయి
తు

యిందురువలాగ్ని భట్టసత్తను తరువాత యిందనుంచి
వబ్బి మొత్తసుంచరు కూడ శక్తిలేనంపి సుపత్తు యివరచిన్ని
సుచ్చి యిన్ను నంబువసుని రాంగురువలాగ్ని భట్టను
దూర జాతిలోం దులిందు యిన్ని మాతో వస్తాంచా
గ్గి నక్కొబరజోయి ద్వారగ్గా యివచూస్తే తొయిల్లు దో
యిద్వారగ్గా యిలచరిబ్బురుంచిచరల్లానల్లా లా
స్థానాలి కొంచేలింర పెట్టక్కి స్తాలన్న నోలబువనిశేభ్యం
రంచిపాయి గని చెల్లదిపత్రవన్నా బరిదూరే గా పట్టుగ్గం
రూపాయిగ్గానన్నా మాత్ర లతేక గుడ్డెండలు యిరుచ్చా
బే.

యివర్ష మనల్ని జీర్ణాకారనిసే తిర్గాడు తూమూర్తు
డిస్మిస్ చేసారడంచి లాజిక్ కొంట్టుచ్చి స్థాపిం
చారనాకరిసి లాభిత్ చారనల్లా పట్టి సన్నదుబ్రహ్మగ్గా
ఖిలాగ్నన్నాలాగ్ని నోంచి జీవన్నిసనాగ్ని చూడు చాలనీ
మంచిదే యిన్ని మనస్సాలగచారంచేసుకొన్ని స్థాపించి
స్థగ్గా చారసుంజీవండి సోమ్ములాగ్ని భట్టిన బోధించి
త్తాచారసుంచోదోవన్నా స్థానుచుగ్గా ప్రకాంతాయిగ్గా

Mnz. 1 A]

190 SL20

From

To

The Deputy Commr
Tumkur Distt.

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

In continuation of the marginally noted communication from this office, has the honor to forward herewith petition registered no. 3253 dated 4th January 1907 from Rama Sastry re the Godi Kante Village Wadderhalli in the Tumkur Taluk, and to request the early submission of the —

GPB—3,000—21-7-05

X. Govt Ord. no 5483 Dy 25·5·1906.
& " no. 3456 Dy 11·1·1907.

report already called for

on the subject

By order,

Sd)

Secretary.

Muz. 5]

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

190

From

The Secretary to the Government
of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

To The Dy: Commissioner
Tumkur Dt

Dated

Despatched 18th May 1907

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 5417
M. No.

This Office No. 3456 dated

11-1-1907 calling for the submission of an early report re the Jodi Kaule Waderahalli village in the Tumkur Taluk

and subsequent reminder marginally noted

Vol. 4598 D/19.3.07
D.O D/23.5.07

Has the honor to draw attention to the above and to request ~~to be informed as to what action has been taken in the matter and when a reply may be expected.~~ the favor of an early reply thereto

By Order,

Sd/- 16/5/07
Secretary,
Muzrai Department.

21
8/5/07

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Tumkur,
25th May 1907

My dear Sir,

In answer to your D O. of the 23rd instant, I beg to inform that the petitioner Subbamma connected with the records relating to Jodi Kantevadera halli village is reported to be now at Dodalaballapur in the Kolar District. Summonses were issued for her appearance on the 29th

GPB—3,000—22 6 06

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

Urgent S.121

190

From The Deputy Commr
Tinnelly District

To The Secy to the
Govt of Mysore
Mily Dept

Dated 1st
Despatched Do } June 1907
Received
General No.
No. 905

Enclosure No 3 and one file

5488

16/07

e contd & subd orders.

No docket no 345 6
dated 11th January 07

Submitting a report on the Memorial addressed to H.H the Maha Rajah of Mysore by Subbamma praying for a recommendation of the order recently passed by the Sessions Judge of Tinnevelly in the Tinnevelly Caste

Deputy Commissioner's office
Tumkur District.

Dated, Tumkur, 1st June 1907.

From

K Doraswami Iyer Esqr
Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District.

To

L Anantaswami Rao Esqr B.A.
Secretary to the Government
of H.H. the Maha Rajah of
Mysore, Muzarai Department
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your docket no 3456 dated 11th January 1907 and reminder dockets Nos. 4598 and 5417 dated the 19th March 1907 and the 18th May 1907 respectively, calling for a report on the Memorial addressed to His Highness the Maha Rajah of Mysore by Subbamma praying for a reconsideration of the order relating to the Jodi &

Kanteradevanahalli village in the Tumkur Taluk, I have the honor to state that the Inam village, in question was originally granted for the support of the Sri Prasanna Narajina Iswara Swamie temple at Kolala in the Tumkur Taluk. But during the Inam Settlement it was somehow settled as Personal Inam in the name of one Gurumurthi Bhatta. This individual died a bachelor in 1899. One Krishna ppa, Claiming to be a cousin of the deceased sold the village for Rs 1450/ to one Venkatakrishniah of Seetakal village. The Memorialist and another Ramaswamy having brought a Complaint

against the action of the
said Krishnappa, the matter
was enquired into with the
consequence that an arrange-
-ment was come to with
the purchaser Venkata
Krishniah who consented
to make over the village
to the temple 20 years hence
and to pay in the mean-
while a sum of Rupees 91-
annually to the temple besides
the Jodi due to Government.
The arrangement was sanction-
-ed by Government in their
Proceedings No. 1074-6 dated the
20th September 1904. The necessary
agreement duly registered
was also subsequently en-
obtained from Venkata Krishnaya
as per Government Proceedings
No 5483 dated the 23rd May
1906

Now

Now the Memorialists'
Contention is that inasmuch
as the Jodi village in question
is either a Devadayam or
Brahmadayam Inam, it should
be enjoyed by Brahmins
and Brahmins alone either
connected with the Temple
service or otherwise — and not
by a Non-Brahmin like
Venkatakrishnaya who is a
Goldsmith
by caste. The Memorialist
claims the village as a
bequest from her uncle
(mother's brother) Iyen
Moorti Bhatta and prays,
therefore, that the village
may be left in her enjoy-
ment during her lifetime
and that thereafter it may
be made over to the Sri
Parakalamatha Mukyaprana Swamy
Swamy Temple at Kalale.
The testamentary deed of
gift alleged to have been

executed by Gurunaoorte Bhatta in favour of the Memorialist is not forthcoming in the file of vernacular records herewith submitted. In her statement before the Sunk-dar of the Sundur Taluk on the 27th May 1907, she says she has no other document to produce in support of her claim.

Under these circumstances, no reconsideration of the order already passed on the subject needs now be called for.

The enclosures to the docket under reference are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir

Your most obedient Servant

M. Srinivasmurthy

For Deputy Commr.

Dft as per bis orders

Sd ??

No. 345/8.7.07

Endorsement granted to Subbanna reading in yejaman Subba Bhatta's house, Tumkur, with reference to her memorial registered no. 887/2814 dated 10th Decr. 1906 addressed to HH. The Maharaja praying for a re-Consideration of the Govt order relating to the gode Kantevaderhalle village in the Tumkur Taluk, endowed to the Sri Prasanna Ranjineeswaraswamy temple at Kolala, in the said Tk-

In reply, the memorialist is informed that there is no rule to the effect that the Devadaya Inam land should not be in the possession of a non-brahmin, and further the present holder, a goldsmith, holds the village merely as a lessee under the temple-

2 // In these circs, the ~~Grounds of appeal~~ arguments put forward by her for a review of

the Govt order do not require any notice Her petition is accordingly rejected

By order,

Dft) [illegible]
29/6/07 Secretary

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Dy Comm., Sumkur Distt with ref to his letter no 995 Dy 1 8th June 1907

2) the vernacular records are herewith returned

By order,

Dft) [illegible]
Secretary

29/6/07